IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANTONY DOMINIC

FRIDAY, THE 23RD NOVEMBER 2007 / 2ND AGRAHAYANA 1929

WP(C).No. 26263 of 2007(B)

PETITIONER:

ANNIE JOSEPH,
B.ED. STUDENT, ST.THOMAS COLLEGE OF TEACHER
EDUCATION, MYLACOMPU P.O., THODUPUZHA,
IDUKKI DISTRICT.

BY ADV. SRI.M.POLY MATHAI

RESPONDENTS:

---

1. THE MAHATMA GANDHI UNIVERSITY,
REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR, PRIYADARSHINI HILLS,
KOTTAYAM.

2. RANI DURGAVATHI VISHWAVIDYALAYA,
REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR, SARASWATHI VIHAR,
PANCHPEDI, JABALPUR.

3. THE ST.THOMAS COLLEGE OF TEACHER
EDUCATION, REPRESENTED BY ITS PRINCIPAL,
MYLACOMPU P.O., THODUPUZHA.

BY ADV. SRI. T.A. SHAJI, SC, M.G.UNIVERSITY
SRI.V.M.KURIAN
SRI.MATHEW B. KURIAN
SRI.K.T.THOMAS

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 23/11/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

W.P.(C) No. 262263 of 2007

APPENDIX

Petitioner's Exhibits:-

P1: True copy of the Degree certificate of petitioner for B.A. Issued by 2nd respondent in 2-1-2003.

P2: True copy of the marksheet of the petitioner for her M.A. Final Exam. By the 2nd respondent University dated 11-7-02.

P3: True copy of the application dated 29-6-2007

P4: True copy of the communication dated 30-6-2007 from the 1st respondent to the petitioner.

P5: True copy of the certificate issued by the 2nd respondent dated 19-7-2007.

P6: True copy of the receipt dated 24-7-2007.

Antony Dominic, J.

- -

W.P.(C) No. 26263 of 2007

- -

Dated this the 23rd day of November, 2007

JUDGMENT

Petitioner who had completed her B.A. and M.A. Degree from the 2nd respondent University has approached this Court on account of the delay in recognizing the basic degree obtained by her from the 2nd respondent University. In Ext.P4 memo the 1st respondent had directed the petitioner to produce materials for considering the application made by the petitioner in this behalf. But when the petitioner has approached the 2nd respondent, she was informed that only if the 1st respondent University directly addresses the 2nd respondent for the same, the 2nd respondent will furnish the details called for. Since the 2nd respondent is insisting on a direct communication from the 1st respondent and since the 1st respondent itself asked for the materials, it is only proper that the 1st respondent should satisfy the requirements set by the 2nd respondent for furnishing the details.

2. In the circumstances, I dispose of the writ petition directing that the 1st respondent shall address the 2nd respondent calling for the details mentioned in Ext.P4 memo and as soon as it is received, the 1st respondent shall consider the request of the petitioner for recognizing her basic degree that she has obtained from the 2nd respondent University.

Antony Dominic,
Judge.

mn.